



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/857,145	05/31/2001	Brian Fields	CC-3184	9252

7590 11/18/2003

Woodcock Washburn Kurtz  
Mackiewicz & Norris  
46th Floor  
One Liberty Place  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

EXAMINER
----------

MAI, TRI M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3727

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

NK

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/857,145

Applicant(s)

FIELDS, BRIAN

Examiner

Tri M. Mai

Art Unit

3727

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 7,12
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Legends A and B should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clarke, III in view of Carnaudmetal (WO9637414), and further in view of either Schmalbach (EP432659) or the admitted prior art. Clarke, III teaches a container having a center panel that can be made with various sizes (col. 2, line 24), and an area of less than .5 square inches. Clarke, III meets all claimed limitations except for the diameter of the center panel being less than 1.835 and the ratio aspect between 1.3 and 1.7. Carnaudmetal teaches that it is known in the art to provide various diameters for a center panel (Table 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the diameter of the center panel being less than 1.835 in Clarke, III as taught by Carnaudmetal to provide the desired end wall for the container.

With respect to the opening ratio, Schmalbach teaches that it is known in the art to provide an opening about 1.5 (31mm/20mm about the opening in Fig. 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the opening with a ratio about 1.5 in Clarke, III as taught by Schmalbach to provide the desired opening for the container.

Furthermore, the specification discloses an opening with a ratio about 1.47 (page 8, line 13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide an opening with a ratio about 1.5 in Clarke, III as taught by the admitted prior art to provide the desired opening for the container.

Even to the degree it is argued that the flow rate is not being taught by the applied references as set forth above. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method design of such product. If the product in is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different design process.

***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed during the interview dated 10/03/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. During the interview applicant presented several arguments, including one argument of how the inflow of air is important in the design of the opening of the can. It is noted that this arguments is centered on the graph of Fig. 3 wherein B set forth the claimed ratio compared to those of prior art in A and C. Applicant is noted that the claimed ratio would allow air to enter much more easily than the prior art disclosure of A. This is further detailed in Applicant's declaration as set forth in paper No. 9. During the interview, applicant admits that the prior art of embodiment A would have inherent characteristic as of the claimed invention, i.e., with larger radius to the side the opening would allow more air into the container and a better flow rate is obtained.

It is submitted that none of the functionalities is being recited in claim 1, and clearly the claimed container is specific to the ratio and the ratio is disclosed in both the submitted Prior Art, Carnaudmetal, and Schmalbach as set forth above. Although these teachings do not teach the flow rate, however, the flow rate characteristics are not being recited in the claim. Furthermore, the claimed ratio is specifically taught in these references and thus would **inherently** have the flow rate as claimed.


Even to the degree it is argued that the flow rate is not being taught by the applied references as set forth above. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method design of such product. If the product in is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different design process.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tri M. Mai whose telephone number is (703)308-1038. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lee W Young can be reached on (703)308-2572. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1148.

Tri M. Mai   
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3727